

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**v.**

**CRIMINAL NO. 4:23CR116-SA**

**RONNELL PRATT A/K/A “PJ”  
JARVIS HOOD**

**MOTION TO RESTRICT ACCESS**

Pursuant to L.U. Civ. R. 79, the government files this Motion to Restrict Access to Exhibit 1 of the government’s Second Motion in Limine.

“Judicial records belong to the American people; they are public, not private, documents.” *Binh Hoa Le v. Exeter Fin. Corp.*, 990 F.3d 410, 417 (5th Cir. 2021); *see also Murry v. City of Indianola, Mississippi*, No. 4:23CV-97-DMB-DAS, 2023 WL 8655261, at \*1 (N.D. Miss. Dec. 14, 2023). Therefore, “[t]he Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals requires “a working presumption ... that judicial records should not be sealed.” *Murry*, 2023 WL 8655261, at \*1 (quoting *June Med. Servs., L.L.C. v. Phillips*, 22 F.4th 512, 521 (5th Cir. 2022)). To determine whether to disclose or seal a judicial record, the Court must balance the public's common law right of access against interests favoring non-disclosure. *Jaufre ex rel. Jaufre v. Taylor*, 351 F. Supp. 2d 514, 516 (E.D. La. 2005) (citing *S.E.C. v. Van Waeyenberghe*, 990 F.2d 845, 849 (5th Cir.1993)).

The government’s filing moves the Court to make a preliminary determination of the authenticity of records and has prepared as a conventional filing “Exhibit 1,” which consists of copies of records provided in discovery from various entities and electronic communication providers. Many of the items contain personal identity identifiers throughout. The motion itself discusses the evidence in generalities and includes screenshots of items without any PII, but it is necessary for the government to file the full records for the Court to review in its determination.

Due to the personal subject matter of the incident reports, the government specifically requests that Exhibit 1 to its motion be sealed from public access only, with CM/ECF access permitted to the litigants' counsel. Redaction would not be practical given the volume of records that contains identifiers and the details necessary for this Court to review in context with the certificates.

“The decision to seal is made on ‘a case-by-case, document-by-document, line-by-line’ basis and must be “congruent to the need.” *Evans v. Evans*, No. 522CV00037DCBBWR, 2023 WL 2776681, at \*1 (S.D. Miss. Apr. 4, 2023) (quoting *Binh Hoa Le v. Exeter Fin. Corp.*, 990 F.3d 410, 419-20 (5th Cir. 2021)).

The public's right to access will be served by the public motion generally detailing the evidence the government seeks to exclude, should the Court grant the relief. For these reasons, the government submits that sealing is supported by clear and compelling reasons of the defendants' and witnesses' privacy and further that sealing is narrowly tailored to serve those reasons. L.U. Civ. R. 79(b).

Accordingly, the United States Attorney hereby moves the Court to restrict access to non-parties to Exhibit 1 of the government's Second Motion in Limine pursuant to L.U. Civ. R. 79.

Respectfully submitted,

CLAY JOYNER  
United States Attorney

By: /s/ Julie Howell Addison  
JULIE HOWELL ADDISON  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Mississippi Bar No.103573  
900 Jefferson Avenue  
Oxford, Mississippi 38655  
(662) 234-3351  
Fax: (662) 234-0657

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Julie Howell Addison, Assistant United States Attorney for the Northern District of Mississippi, certify that a copy of the foregoing Government's Motion was filed with the Clerk of Court using CM/ECF system, which provided electronic notice to all counsel of record.

This, the 4th day of October, 2024.

/s/ Julie Howell Addison

JULIE HOWELL ADDISON  
Assistant United States Attorney